



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,368	05/07/2007	Thierry Duffar	BEAUMONT-39	8389
45722	7590	03/31/2008	EXAMINER	
Howard IP Law Group P.O. Box 226 Fort Washington, PA 19034			HITESHEW, FELISA CARLA	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1792		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		03/31/2008		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/587,368	DUFFAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Felisa C. Hiteshew	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/26/2006</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Priority***

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 01/30/2004. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of French application 0450177 as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The PTOL 1449 of 07/26/2006 has been received, reviewed and considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Application No. 05044681 (Ozawa).

EP '681 teaches a method and apparatus for a vertical cylindrical crucible, high pressure solid-phase solidification. The crucible contains a liquid phase (3), a solid phase (2), and a conductive member (12) around the side of the vertical vessel (5), along with a high-frequency induction coil (13). The molten liquid (3) is moved away from the inner wall surface by use of an electromagnetic repulsive force between the molten liquid (3) and the conductive member (12).

The difference being that EP '691 does not teach an interstice existing between the solid-phase and the crucible. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify and optimize the process and apparatus limitation in order to ensure proper orientation. The motivation being to prevent contact solidification through the cooling of the molten liquid with the vessel and producing high quality, high yielding single crystals.

2 step test for analogous art: 1) Decide if art is in the field of the inventors endeavor. 2) if not, determine if reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved. *In re Deminski* 230 USPQ 313, 315 (Fed. Cir. 1986);

*Stratoflex Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.* 218 USPQ 871, 876 (CCPA 1983); *In re Wood* 202 USPQ 171, 174 (CCPA 1979).

Art is analogous when it solves the same problem as applicant. *In re Melvin* 165 USPQ 168 (CCPA).

But the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not applicant's disclosure. *In re Gangadahara*, 13 USPQ 2d 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. *In re Opprect* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12; *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278; *In re Bozek* 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); *In re Van Mater* 144 USPQ 421; *In re Jacoby* 135 USPQ 317; *In re LeGrice* 133 USPQ 365; *In re Preda* 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felisa Hiteshew whose telephone number is (571) 272-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM with Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-1463.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system. see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866- 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Felisa C. Hiteshew/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792